

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Xiaoyu Li et al.
Serial No.: 10/803,337
Filed: March 18, 2004
Confirmation No.: 5568
Group Art Unit: 3682
Examiner: Boes, Terence
For: ONE-TOUCH MANUAL TELESCOPE AND TILT STEERING
COLUMN

Attorney Docket No.: DP-310459

Mail Stop AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Dear Sir:

An Examiner Interview was held between Applicant's attorney, Mr. David Burns, and Examiners, Mr Terence Boes and Mr. Richard Ridley, on March 13, 2007, 10:00 a.m..

During this interview, it was mutually decided that:

1. Base Claim 3 of the present application is not anticipated by the Li et al. US 2005/0199087 because the guide (44) of the Li '087 reference is connected rigidly to the upper steering column jacket (14) via the bolt identified as wedge member (A) by the Examiner and thus the guide (44) is not connected rigidly to the lower steering column jacket (12) of Li '087. At best, there is an adjustable relationship between the lower steering column jacket (12) and guide (44). That is, the guide (44) moves with

- respect to the lower steering column jacket (12) and thereby can not be connected rigidly to it. The guide (48) of Claim 1 of the present application is connected rigidly to the lower jacket (12).
2. Dependent Claim 4 of the present application is not anticipated by the Li et al. US 2005/0199087 if the term "pivotally associated with" is changed to "pivotally connected to." This change is incorporated presently by this amendment;
 3. Claim 8 of the present application is not anticipated by the Li et al. US 2005/0199087 reference because the alleged element (B) of Li '087 is not a separate part from the guide (44). Therefore, Li '087 does not have an engaging element;
 4. Base Claim 10 of the present application is not anticipated by the Li et al. US 2005/0199087 if the term "pivotally associated with" is changed to "pivotally connected to." Moreover, it was agreed that the alleged linking member of Li is not "monolithic." This change is incorporated presently by this amendment; and
 5. The rejection of Claims 15 and 19 is an error and are actually conditionally allowed for Claim 15 and allowed for Claim 19.

Respectfully submitted,

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.

April 20, 2007

Date

/DAVID A. BURNS/

David A. Burns, Registration No. 46,238

Howard and Howard Attorneys, P.C.

The Pinchurst Office Center, Suite 101

39400 Woodward Avenue

Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-5151

(248) 723-0487